



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/393,405	09/10/1999	CHRISTOPHER J. HOWARD	003936.P001X	2647

21127 7590 02/24/2003

KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP
ONE STATE STREET
SUITE 1510
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

ELISCA, PIERRE E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/393,405

Applicant(s)
Howard, Christopher J.

Examiner
Pierre E. Elisca

Art Unit
3621



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 26, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-43, 62-64, 78-80, And 95-110 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-43, 62-64, 78-80, And 95-110 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION
RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment, filed on 11/26/2002.
2. Claims 24-43, 62-64, 78-80, and 95-110 are pending.
3. The rejection to claims 24-43, 62-64, 78-80, and 95-110 under 35 U.S.C 102 (e) as being anticipated by Dykes et al (U.S. pat. No. 5,872,915) as set forth in the Office action mailed on 08/21/2002 is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 24-43, 62-64, 78-80, and 95-110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Dykes et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,872,915).

As per claims 24-36, 40, 62-64, and 78-80, Dykes discloses a computer system/method for providing security checking for software applications accessed via the WWW (which is seen to read

Art Unit: 3621

as Applicant's claimed invention wherein it is stated that a method for controlling access to information by a web browser), comprising:

presenting content within a browser window of the web browser (**see., abstract, lines 1-10, col 3, lines 22-58, col 4, lines 47-57, please note that NETSCAPE is capable of presenting content or object within a browser window of the web browser**); and

disabling a disallowed user function when the content is within the browser window (**see., abstract, lines 1-10, col 3, lines 22-58, col 4, lines 47-57, please note that NETSCAPE is capable of disabling and disallowed user function**).

As per claims 37-39, 41, Dykes discloses the claimed method, wherein the content comprises user perceivable information in a hyper-text markup language (HTML) format (**see., col 5, lines 10-27, col 8, lines 16-29**).

As per claims 42, Dykes discloses the claimed method, wherein the content comprises user perceivable information in a common gateway interface (CGI) language format (**see., fig 4, element 420**).

As per claim 43, Dykes discloses the claimed method, wherein the content comprises user perceivable information in a JAVA language format (**see., col 8, lines 16-29**).

Art Unit: 3621

As per claims 95, 97, 98, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 107, 109, and 110, Dykes discloses a computer system/method for providing security checking for software applications accessed via the WWW (which is seen to read as Applicant's claimed invention wherein it is stated viewer program operatively connect able to a source of content, the viewer program having a plurality of functions related to presenting the content from the source), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving content from the source (see., abstract, lines 1-10, col 3, lines 22-58, figs 2-4, specifically wherein it is stated that data stream may be presented to web server application...., please the web server is receiving content from the client workstation);

receiving function authorization data indicating which of the viewer functions may be performed on the content from the source (see., abstract, figs 2-4, col 4, lines 33-67, col 5, lines 1-62, col 9, lines 7-65, gateway or authorization);

presenting the content with the viewer program (abstract, lines 1-10, col 3, lines 22-58, col 4, lines 47-57, please note that NETSCAPE is capable of presenting content or object with the viewer program or within a browser window of the web browser);

disabling selected viewer functions in accordance with the function authorization data received from the source (see., abstract, lines 1-10, col 3, lines 22-58, col 4, lines 47-57, please note that NETSCAPE is capable of disabling viewer or user function).

As per claim 96, 99, 102, 106, and 108, Dykes discloses the claimed method, wherein the disabled viewer functions are selected from the group consisting of print, page set-up, save, save as,

Art Unit: 3621

view source, save picture as, set as wallpaper, copy, screen capture, print screen and cut functions (see., col 4, lines 47-57, please note the NETSCAPE is capable of doing the limitations above such as print, page set-up, save, save as, view source, save picture as, set as wallpaper, copy, screen capture, print screen and cut functions).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 11/26/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

REMARKS

7. In response to claims 24-43, 62-64, 78-80, and 95-110, Applicant argues that the prior art of record taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest: “ disabling a disallowed user function”. As specified by the Examiner in the Office action mailed on 2/20/2002, page 3, this limitation is inherently disclosed by Dykes since a NETSCAPE is capable of presenting content or object within a browser window of the Web browser, and therefore, capable of disabling a disallowed user function, abstract, lines 1-10, col 3, lines 22-58, col 4, lines 47-57).

On 06/04/2002, Applicant also requested that the Examiner produce a reference that support the assertion “ disallowing certain user functions”. Accordingly, a reference (Wallent et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6,366,912) is provided ., see., col 12, lines 4-13, specifically wherein it is stated that at a step 918, a decision is made, based on the user's input, whether to allow or disallow the requested operation. If the user specifies that the operation is to be disallowed..., please note that whether to allow means

Art Unit: 3621

that the user function provides for non-ephemeral reproduction of the content as recited in claim 40).
Therefore, Wallent et al. supports this assertion.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Pierre Eddy Elisca at (703) 305-3987. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 6:30AM to 5:00PM.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on (703) 305-9768.

Any response to this action should be mailed to :

Application/Control Number: 09/393,405

Page 7

Art Unit: 3621

Commissioner of Patents of Trademarks

Washington, D. C. 20231

The Official Fax Number for TC-3600 is:


(703) 305 7687



Pierre Eddy Elisca

Patent Examiner

February 20, 2003



**JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**